

Southside/Rolling Hills June 15, 2010 Meeting Summary

Steering Committee Attendees:

Joe Parker, Ray Eurquhart, Rick Pendergrass, Becky Winders, Aaron Cain, Herman Graham Jr., Lorisa Seibel, Marie Hunter, Dan Levine, Rev. Jerome J. Washington, Michael Spencer, Councilman Howard Clement III, Camilla Faust, Sandy Demeree and Mike Byrd.

Other Attendees:

Pastor Sylvester Williams, George Roberson, Tonya Dancy, Joshua Dancy, Gloria Rentrope, Reginald Johnson, Marshall Williams, Amelia Thorpe, Wilmur Conyers, Mike Barros, Keith Chadwell, Richard Valzonis, Jim Wise, Barney Rogers, Karl Schlachter, Mary Kellers, Larry Jarvis and Esther Shin.

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Ray Eurquhart opened the meeting with a welcome and turned the meeting over to Karl Schlachter from McCormack Baron Salazar. Before reviewing the Rolling Hills/Southside Presentation, Mr. Schlachter said that the team will be scheduling a meeting in the near future to prioritize the plan and get community input on the design guidelines. Mr. Schlachter then turned the presentation over to Mary Keller. See attached power point presentation that reviewed the following:

Presentation of Rolling Hills / Southside Redevelopment Plan Outline:

A. Purpose

- i. Must conform with State Statute – Urban Redevelopment Law
- ii. Documents the revitalization plan and associated activities
- iii. Provides an official guide for future policy / development standards affecting the redevelopment area

B. Redevelopment Area Boundaries

Redevelopment Plan – Table of Content:

A. Part I. Introduction

B. Part II. Existing Conditions

C. Part III. Goals & Objectives

- i. Housing, Commercial, Density / Land Use, Community Assets, Human Capital (housing services)

D. Part IV. Revitalization Plan

- i. Land Use Map
- ii. RH Site Plan
- iii. Streets & Public Right-of-Ways Map
- iv. Traffic Study

E. Part V. Redevelopment Projects

- 1. Phase I, II & III Rolling Hills & Southside Rental and For Sale
 - i. Rolling Hills / Southside site plan
 - a. Live / Work Units
 - b. Rolling Hills/Roxboro gateway/entrance
 - ii. Lakewood Creek / Linear Park Cleanup
- 2. Physical Improvements
 - i. Redevelopment Area Boundary Map – location of:
 - ii. Existing Streets - Improvements / Green Streets
 - iii. Fisher Place – eliminate cul-de-sac and create development parcel
 - iv. South Street/St. Theresa Flats gateway/entrance
 - v. Whitted School – plans for stabilization
- 3. Future Study Areas
 - i. Whitted School – future use
 - ii. Mangum Connector
 - iii. Passive / Natural Public Park

F. Part VI. Implementation

- 1. Phasing & Schedule
- 2. Finance Plan
- 3. Redevelopment Standards, Regulations, Restrictions & Controls
 - a. Design Guidelines
 - b. Process for Approving Future Development

Mr. Schlachter said that the goal is to take the final redevelopment plan to the Council for approval. Lorisa Seibel pointed out that the five goals all seem physical development oriented, where are the services? Ms. Keller responded that the State statutes heavily focus on the physical revitalization piece, but the human capital piece is critical. Mr. Eurquhart asked where the Human Capital Plan gets added? Mr. Schlachter said that currently the Human Capital Plan is on track with the physical revitalization plan and both need to move along parallel tracks, but should be two separate documents where key decisions are made in conjunction with one another.

Mike Barros asked if transportation improvements would be placed on these goals? Would you put it in and where? Ms. Kellers said that was a good question and maybe needs to be its own goal?

Sandy Demeree asked for clarification on Rental for Sale. Mr. Schlachter said that means the site could go either rental or for-Sale.

Rev. Washington asked who has the last word on Whitted? Mr. Jarvis stated that the County owns the site so they would have the last word.

Mr. Eurquhart asked for clarification on substantial rehabilitation. Mr. Schlachter said that this would need to be discussed as a part of the design guidelines. How much is substantial rehabilitation and what is the process for getting it done? Mr. Eurquhart asked how soon the possibility of rehab would be explored. Mr. Schlachter said it should be discussed at the next meeting.

A question was raised about the design guidelines for re-hab buildings. Larry Jarvis stated that generally design guidelines are developed for new construction and not re-hab.

Another question arose about boundaries for the project. Mr. Schlachter reviewed again the map in the power point. A question was raised about home repair and design guidelines. Mr. Schlachter informed everyone that general repairs are not subject to design guideline, but substantial repairs would.

A question arose about budget priorities related to home repair. Mr. Jarvis informed everyone that the City of Durham currently has a program that is available to homeowners for home repair, but said that the City would look into whether or not there is a need for a separate program for the 125 acres.

What about people that will be cut out because they do not live in the exact area, but nearby? Mr. Jarvis said that at some point a boundary has to be drawn and unfortunately that may mean that some properties will be left out, but we went back to the original boundaries set forth in the St. Theresa Plan from the 80's to remain consistent with what the neighborhood had intended for planning back then.

Mr. Schlachter said that the team has a few more studies to complete, but then will be prepared to work with developing the Design Guidelines. He looked to Joe Parker and Ray Eurquhart to identify a sub-committee that the development team should work with to develop those guidelines. Is it an existing committee or a new committee?

Councilman Clement raised the issue of the importance of the Whitted School to the discussion. He asked what would be done with the school and how will

we deal with the issue? He also suggested that the School Board should be included in the discussion. He asked if there was sub-committee focused on the issue. Mr. Eurquhart stated there was a Whitted sub-committee that had been chaired by Dianne Pledger, but due to timing, she could no longer lead the committee. The Steering Committee has decided to roll that issue into the Human Capital Sub-Committee. He agreed that bringing in the school board may be important to bringing in resources. Mr. Schlachter said he would look into getting a cost estimate on maintenance for the building. Mr. Jarvis pointed out that the School Board no longer owns the building, the County owns the site and recently said they would be willing to turn it over depending upon the direction of the Steering Committee. Mike Byrd said that at the last Human Capital Sub-Committee meeting, the group agreed to discuss Whitted and there is a desire to utilize it for services. Rev. Washington asked if the SC has the authority to submit an idea for the school? Mr. Eurquhart said yes. Rev. Washington asked how soon the HC Sub-Committee would be ready to submit a proposal. Mr. Byrd said that at this time the committee continues to work on developing ideas for the school. Mr. Eurquhart asked if Urban Strategies would be prepared to discuss its Adams School project as an example of how a school building can be-reutilized. Esther Shin said yes.

Ms. Seibel said she did not have a clear timeline for the plan. Mr. Schlachter said that once the SC has consensus on the plan, then it will need to go to the City, then to the Planning Commission and then back to the Council for approval. If the SC could reach consensus in the next 30 days then we would look to the City to approve by October. Ms. Seibel asked what is the work that needs to get this done? Mr. Schlachter said the SC will need to provide input into each component that Ms. Kellers just presented. Ms. Seibel asked when we would have the total budget. Mr. Schlachter said the next two to four weeks. Dan Levine asked for clarification on how the plan could delay the revitalization. Mr. Schlachter said that it does not and is not mandatory, but it is important to us that we have consensus from the SC prior to presenting to the Council. Mr. Parker asked if an interim meeting was needed. Mr. Eurquhart pointed out that there is still the issue of the design guidelines.

George Roberson asked what percentage of jobs for both the Self-Help properties and McCormack Baron Salazar will be local. Mr. Schlachter said that this is where the Human Capital piece is critical to preparing individuals for employment opportunities that will emerge and hiring guidelines will need to be developed in partnership with the City.

II. Sub-Committee Reports

A. Human Capital

Mr. Byrd reported that the last HC meeting took place on May 20th and sixteen people were in attendance. The group prioritized the Human Capital Plan. Please see attached report.

Rev. Washington asked what are the priorities? Where are they prioritized and where is Whitted on the list of priorities? Mr. Byrd reviewed the summary of the last meeting (see attached report)

An audience commented that there are lots of itty bitty eye sores in the community, but the school is one big eye sore. All the itty bitty ones are just as important, even if not big and something needs to be done to address them.

Mr. Parker suggested accepting the Human Capital Report and the SC agreed.

B. Housing

Ms. Seibel distributed the summary from the last Housing Sub-Committee meeting.

III. Next Meeting Dates

Human Capital – July 7
Steering Committee – July 20

Ms. Demeree announced that she must resign from the SC, but will continue to work with the HC Sub-Committee.

Respectfully submitted by Esther Shin